<center>**Remarks**</center>

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claim 31 has been amended. The claim amendments should in no way be construed to be acquiescence to any rejection based on alleged prior art. The amendments to the claims are made solely to expedite the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, none of the claim amendments are related to patentability, and do not narrow the claims as originally presented. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or subsequent patent applications.

<center>**Rejection of Claims 1-18, 20-29 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being Anticipated By Saulpaugh**</center>

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 3 and paragraphs 27-31, a mobile agent object may discover the services available in a host-computing environment by requesting and receiving a service listing from the directory service object 205 at blocks 303 and 306. The mobile agent then checks the service listing for a desired service at block 310, and if the service is available, the mobile agent requests the service at block 316.

As discussed in paragraph 5 of the specification, U.S. Pat. No. 6,016,393 to White et al., entitled, "System and Method for Distributed Computation Based upon the Movement, Execution, and Interaction of Processes in a Network", discloses a system that improves upon the concept of remote programming by utilizing processes called mobile agents (sometimes referred to as mobile objects or agent objects). The system described by White et al., provides the ability for an object (the mobile agent object), existing on a first ("host") computer system,

<center>- 9 -</center>

to transplant itself to a second ("remote host") computer system while preserving its current execution state, and thereafter resume execution.

In contrast, Saulpaugh fails in any manner to teach or suggest a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment. The "client" of Saulpaugh (col. 47, ln. 6) that the Examiner seems to regard as a mobile agent object is actually a mobile client device, which includes cell phones, PDAs, laptops, notebook computers, *etc.* (See column 6, lines 51-59 of Saulpaugh.) Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 8, 14, 18, 24, and 31

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-29

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-29 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies on Claims 1, 8, 14, 18, and 24.

Rejection of Claims 19 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Saulpaugh in view of admitted prior art

Claim 19

The admitted prior art fails to supply the teachings missing from Saulpaugh, as described for Claim 18 above. Thus, Claim 19 is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 18.

Claim 30

As Saulpaugh does not antcipate Claim 24, above, it also cannot render Claim 30 unpatentable, as Claim 30 depends from Claim 24.

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office Action.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC

/P. G. Scott Born/

P. G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491